

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/629,680	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HAMMOND ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> BRENT STACE	<b>Art Unit</b> 2161	

**All Participants:**

(1) BRENT STACE.

(2) James Goedken.

**Date of Interview:** 23 June 2010

**Status of Application:** RCE

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Time:** 1:25PM EST

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

NA

Claims discussed:

exemplary Claim 1, and 40

Prior art documents discussed:

Budzik

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/BRENT STACE/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2161

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed adding clarity to the independent claims. Specifically the weight and magnitude being based on the task genre and representative stylistic attribute instead of merely the assigning of the weight and magnitude being based on the task genre and representative stylistic attribute. Also added language of what seemed to be intended in the last prior response to the office where the first and second active computer tasks and plurality of text items are different from each other. The applicant clarified to the examiner that the active computer tasks are not intended to read on an active computer programs. Also discussed Claim 40 and how it appears to have missed being canceled like its similar claims (e.g. 52, 61, etc.) have been..